

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
at KNOXVILLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, ) Case No. 3:12-cr-152  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 CAROL J. PAZDER, ) Judge Mattice  
 ) Magistrate Judge Guyton  
 )  
 Defendant. )  
 )

## **ORDER**

On February 7, 2014, United States Magistrate Judge H. Bruce Guyton filed his Report and Recommendation (Doc. 46) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In his Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Guyton recommended that Defendant's Motion to Suppress Statements (Doc. 13) be denied. On February 19, 2014, Defendant filed for leave to file objections to Magistrate Judge Guyton's Report and Recommendation beyond the fourteen-day time period, and the Court extended Defendant's deadline to file objections to March 12, 2014. (Docs. 47, 48). On March 6, 2014, Defendant filed her objections to the Report and Recommendation. (Doc. 49).

The Court notes that, a party's objections must be "clear enough to enable the district court to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious," and generally, "the failure to file specific objections to a magistrate's report constitutes a waiver of those objections." *Smith v. Woods*, 505 F. App'x 560, 564 (6th Cir. 2012). In reviewing Defendant's objections, the Court finds that they are merely reiterations of the original arguments raised in her Motion to Suppress Statements. (*Compare* Doc. 13 at 5-13 *with* Doc. 49 at 6-12). Specifically, excluding several sentences on page 8 of Defendant's

objections, she has stated verbatim her previous arguments. Defendant's actions of simply copying the text of her previous brief and not raising specific objections are inconsistent with notions of judicial efficiency. *Howard v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991).

Thus, the Court finds that further analysis of these same issues would be cumulative and is unwarranted in light of Magistrate Judge Guyton's well-reasoned and well-supported Report and Recommendation, in which he fully addressed Defendant's arguments. Nonetheless, the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the record, specifically including those portions to which Defendant has objected and the transcript of Defendant's Suppression Hearing, and the Court agrees with Magistrate Judge Guyton's analysis and conclusions. *See* Doc. 52.

Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS and ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Guyton's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations pursuant to § 636(b)(1); Defendant's Objections (Doc. 49) are **OVERRULED**; and Defendant's Motion to Suppress Statements (Doc. 13) is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED** this 2nd day of April, 2014.

---

*/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.*  
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE